

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS FOR PARKING DETERMINATION – SHARED PARKING APPROVAL

Discussion

The following section evaluates the decision criteria for a Parking Determination – Shared Parking. Following each approval criterion, findings are made, based primarily on the written narrative and plans submitted by the applicant, establishing that the criterion is met.

Decision Criteria for Parking Determination – Shared Parking

Section 40.55.05. Parking Determination Applications; Purpose

The purpose of a Parking Determination is to establish required number of parking spaces for uses which do not have a parking ratio requirement listed in this Code. The Parking Determination application is established for determining the required number of off street parking spaces in advance of, or concurrent with, applying for approval of an application, development, permit, or other action. This Section is carried out by the approval criteria listed herein.

Standards for Approval:

Section 40.55.15.2.C of the Development Code provides standards to govern the decisions of the Board of Design Review in the evaluation and decision on Parking Determination – Shared Parking applications. The Facilities Review Committee has reviewed the Facilities Review criteria of Section 40.03, and found that there are no conditions of approval applicable to the Parking Determination request. The Board will determine whether the application as presented, meets the Parking Determination – Shared Parking approval criteria. The Board may choose to adopt, not adopt or modify the Committee’s findings and recommended Conditions of Approval. In this report, staff evaluates the application in accordance with the criteria for Parking Determination – Shared Parking.

Section 40.55.15.2.C Approval Criteria

In order to approve a Parking Determination – Shared Parking application, the decision making authority shall make findings of fact based on evidence provided by the applicant demonstrating that all the following criteria are satisfied:

- 1. The proposal satisfies the threshold requirements for a Shared Parking application.***

Facts and Findings:

Section 40.55.15.2.A.1 *Threshold: An application for Shared Parking shall be required when the following threshold apply:*

“The required off street parking for two or more uses will share required

parking spaces.”

The applicant proposes to share all 93 parking stalls between the existing building and the new spa building, to be located in the northern rear portion of the lot. Therefore, the proposal meets the threshold requirement for a Shared Parking application.

Therefore, staff find that the criterion is met.

- 2. *All City application fees related to the application under consideration by the decision making authority have been submitted.***

Facts and Findings:

The applicant paid the required associated fees of \$255.00 for a Shared Parking application on May 14, 2004.

Therefore, staff find that the criterion is met.

- 3. *The location of the shared off street parking is on an abutting property and is within 200 feet of the subject use in which the shared parking is intended to serve, except in Multiple Use zoning districts where the location may be at any distance.***

Facts and Findings:

The applicant is proposing to share parking between two buildings on adjacent properties. The two parcels are considered “abutting”, per the Development Code definition of “abut” because they share a common boundary line.

Therefore, staff find that the criterion is met.

- 4. *If multiple properties are involved, the owners of each of the properties has agreed to the shared parking by entering into a shared parking agreement.***

Facts and Findings:

The applicant is the owner of the existing building, which primarily occupies restaurant uses. The applicant is also the owner of the proposed spa building property and as part of the proposal for that building, the applicant has provided a shared parking analysis. The Facilities Review Committee has reviewed the proposed access and parking to ensure that users of the two buildings will have adequate access to the shared parking stalls. The Committee recommends a condition of approval to require shared parking and access easements to be placed over both parcels to cover all areas where shared parking and access will occur. The condition specifies that the easement should run in perpetuity with the land or for

the duration of time that both properties rely on shared parking to meet the minimum parking requirements.

Therefore, staff find that by satisfying conditions of approval, the criterion is met.

5. *The time of peak parking demand for the various uses located on the subject properties occur at different times of the day.*

Facts and Findings:

The use of the shared parking will occur during the permitted business hours of the CS zone, which are between 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. The applicant's narrative describes the existing uses and the peak hours for the highest parking demand uses, which are the restaurant uses. The applicant states one of the existing restaurant uses caters to primarily a breakfast crowd and that the other restaurant caters to lunch and dinner crowds. The existing nail salon experiences clientele throughout the day. The applicant states the proposed spa building will have a steady clientele throughout the day. It is anticipated that users of the spa would time their visits between meal hours and are not anticipated to have heavy use of the spa during weekend evenings, which would be peak hours for the adjacent restaurant uses.

The applicant's traffic consultant provided a parking analysis dated December 22, 2004 which forecasts that the proposal will provide adequate parking stalls for the uses within the two buildings. The analysis describes the spa as providing women's therapeutic services, rather than a typical health club and spa. There will be no exercise facilities associated with the spa, which would generate a higher demand for parking. The spa is described to provide a range of therapeutic services such as dry and steam saunas and specialized skin treatments. The services will be provided in a series of rooms that are intended to provide one specialized service, rather than services for a large number of patrons. While the spa use is an outright permitted use in the CS zone, the analysis of the intended operations is helpful in determining the actual need for parking stalls. Due to the varying times for peak demands on the existing uses and forecasted demands for the proposed use, the shared parking should adequately accommodate for the two buildings. In addition, the proposed parking is distributed roughly evenly between the two buildings, and within close proximity to building entrances.

Therefore, staff find that the criterion is met.

6. *Adequate parking will be available at all times when the various uses are in operation.*

Facts and Findings:

Staff cites the Facilities Review Committee, Technical Criterion #4 as applicable to Design Review criterion #6. Through the provision of shared parking and through the requested parking reductions of the associated Design Review application, the proposed spa building and existing building will meet the minimum off-street parking requirement for the subject uses. The Facilities Review Committee have evaluated the applicant's request for shared parking and for the parking reduction and have determined that based on the information provided by the applicant, the site will be adequately served with parking stalls.

Therefore, staff find that the criterion is met.

7. *Applications and documents related to the request, which will require further City approval, shall be submitted to the City in the proper sequence.*

Facts and Findings:

The applicant has submitted the required application materials for review of a Shared Parking application. This review process is a required step to receive City approval for the applicant's proposal. The applicant has submitted three (3) additional applications for a Design Review Three (DR2004-0064), a Loading Determination (LO2004-0001), and a Tree Plan Two (TP2004-0021). Because the applications are being reviewed concurrently the Board of Design Review will review all four (4) applications at one public hearing.

Therefore, staff find that the criterion is met.